

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the
Western District of North Carolina

United States of America)	
v.)	
CHADWICK LEE HIGHT)	Case No: <u>2:04CR93-5 & 2:05CR38</u>
)	USM No: <u>18761-058</u>
Date of Original Judgment: <u>July 28, 2005</u>)	
Date of Last Amended Judgment: <u>August 17, 2005</u>)	<u>Ross Richardson</u>
)	Defendant's Attorney

Order Regarding Motion for Sentence Reduction Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2)

Upon motion of ☒ the defendant ☐ the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ☐ the court under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) for a reduction in the term of imprisonment imposed based on a guideline sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered and made retroactive by the United States Sentencing Commission pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 994(u), and having considered such motion, and taking into account the policy statement set forth at USSG §1B1.10 and the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), to the extent that they are applicable,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is:

☒ DENIED. ☐ GRANTED and the defendant's previously imposed sentence of imprisonment (as reflected in the last judgment issued) of _____ is reduced to _____

I. COURT DETERMINATION OF GUIDELINE RANGE (Prior to Any Departures)

Original Offense Level: <u>30</u>	Amended Offense Level: <u>26</u>
Criminal History Category: <u>IV</u>	Criminal History Category: <u>IV</u>
Original Guideline Range: <u>135 to 168 months</u>	Amended Guideline Range: <u>120 months</u>

II. SENTENCE RELATIVE TO AMENDED GUIDELINE RANGE

- ☐ The reduced sentence is within the amended guideline range.
- ☐ The previous term of imprisonment imposed was less than the guideline range applicable to the defendant at the time of sentencing and the reduced sentence is comparably less than the amended guideline range.
- ☐ The reduced sentence is above the amended guideline range.
- ☒ Other (explain): Defendant previously received a reduction in his sentence to the statutory mandatory minimum. Therefore, amendment 750 causes no change in the guideline calculations. It remains at the mandatory minimum. For that reason Defendant is ineligible for a reduction in his sentence pursuant to §3582.

III. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Except as provided above, all provisions of the judgment dated July 28, 2005, shall remain in effect.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Order Date: June 6, 2012

Effective Date: _____
(if different from order date)


Martin Reidinger
United States District Judge

